



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

A Commentary on Catullus. By ROBINSON ELLIS, M. A., LL. D. Second edition. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1889.

In his preface Mr. Ellis states that this "edition differs from the former, as in other points, so particularly in recalling the attention of scholars to the earliest period of Catullian criticism, the latter half of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century." He claims that these scholars had a nicer perception of language, and a more delicate feeling for what was probable in metre, than the later generations. Only two of Scaliger's conjectures and three of Voss's are accepted as certain, while none of Bentley's or Heinsius's are more than probable; none of the eighteenth century corrections of Catullus will stand, except perhaps *Nunc Celtiber es* in XXXIX 17; in the present century only Lachmann's *Graia* in LXVI 58 can be accepted as final. He especially disavows any intention of detracting from the greatness of eminent critics, many of whom he speaks of in terms of the highest appreciation, as Haupt and Lachmann, and notably of Munro, whom he stamps as a master-mind. It may, perhaps, be urged that the earlier commentators had a wider field to work in, and their emendations were the easier ones, while they left the more difficult passages for their successors; though on the other hand it can be said that the extent of knowledge of the present day is more vast, and the opportunities offered for the examination of MSS and by the schools of epigraphy counterbalance the advantages of the earlier critics. This desire to elevate the position of the scholars of the Renaissance is noticeable not only in the preface, but throughout the work, in frequent references to them and their labors in the notes. Not but that the later editors come in for a full share of notice, as Riese (1884), Bährens (1885), Benoist (1882), and Schmidt (1888), whose works have all been published since the first edition of Mr. Ellis's commentary in 1876, but the complaint is a just one that they contain very little that is new.

By far the most valuable part of Mr. Ellis's new work is the various Excursus appended to many of the poems. He there treats of the several points in dispute with a scholarly clearness, and a breadth of view worthy of the learned commentator of Catullus, acknowledging with frankness where an emendation or suggestion of another appears better than his own preconceived idea, yet defending with firmness his position, when it seems to him still the most rational.

There are about thirty of these essays, of which we can only notice:

(1). On X 9, Mr. Ellis accepts as plausible Munro's emendation of putting a full stop after *referret*, and making *Cur quisquam*, etc., a question, but objects that *nihil esse*, followed as it is by *Cur*, can only with violence be separated from it in construction; but Traube's suggestion, "*nihil neque ipsi Hoc praetore fuisse nec cohorti*," he considers as the cleverest of the emendations yet proposed, and may be what Catullus wrote, since the loose rhythm is in its favor, and *ipsi* can easily equal *mihi ipsi*, following as it does so closely on *respondi*; while

*Hoc praetore fuisse* might easily be corrupted into *Nec praetoribus esse* (pp. 39-40).

(2). On XVII 6, Mr. Ellis modifies his former opinion as to the genuineness of this verse, declaring himself as disposed to favor its authenticity.

(3). On XXIX 20 and 23 there is a lengthy excursus, the latter part of which is a discussion of the *opulentissime* of the MSS. Though Ellis retains in his notes his reading *urbis o pudet meae*, he apparently accepts Munro's suggestion of *urbis ob luem ipsimae*, but modifies it by the substitution of *suae* for *ipsimae*, tracing the corruption as running from *opluemsue* to *opluentsue* then *opluentissime*, a course which appears highly probable; indeed it seems that the united thought of these two scholars has finally settled this desperate passage, barring out all other proposals. Ellis would thus make the city referred to Formiae, and not Rome, as Munro thinks.

(4). The LXVIII poem is the subject of a long prolegomenon, in which Ellis boldly maintains his point, in which he is assisted by Lachmann, Haupt, Riese, B. Schmidt, and others, that the poem forms a complete whole, though divisible into two, or perhaps three parts, the last twelve verses forming a kind of epilogue; in this he is opposed by Bergk, Schwabe, Munro, Bährens, and others. Ellis's grounds for his belief are that the repetition of vss. 20-24 in 94-98 are an "indication on the one hand that the two parts were not written simultaneously, on the other that they *are* parts of the same poem"; that "nothing could be a stronger proof of poverty of invention than the recurrence in two completely distinct poems of five identical verses"; and further, that "nowhere in the extant poems of Catullus can any ending be shown so abrupt as *Vltro ego deferrem, copia si qua foret* becomes on the separatist view; nowhere a beginning so startling as *Non possum reticere, deae, qua me Allius in re Iuuerit.*" Ellis claims that his opponents have completely ignored this point on which he lays much stress; and he further claims that the individuals apparently mentioned as two, in the different parts of the poem, are one and the same man, Allius Mallius.

So much has been said for and against the separation of 1-40 from 41-160 that it seems a work of supererogation to renew the discussion; but briefly we may say that the tone of the two poems (for such we conceive them to be) is so entirely different in composition and feeling that it would seem impossible for them to constitute a complete whole. That Catullus should decline so emphatically, and with such good cause, to send his friend any composition of his own, and should then straightway proceed to write a long poem of 120 verses, discoursing of Lesbia, Laodamia, and what not, appears at least improbable. The repetition of vss. 20-24, upon which Prof. Ellis lays such stress, does not seem a strong argument in favor of considering the two poems as one. Verses 1-40 were written under great mental strain from the loss of his brother, in referring to whom these four verses are particularly pathetic and beautiful; what wonder then that he should repeat them in a later poem, when suggested by the mention of the Troad in verse 88, a practice not uncommon among the best poets; 1-40 is written in the most prosaic manner, except when the mention of his brother is direct, and entirely unelaborated, whereas 41-160 is worked up with great care. Again, if considered as a whole, the transition from 40 to 41 is most abrupt, but with all respect to Mr. Ellis, 41 sqq. would not form an inele-

gant beginning to a new poem. That 1-40 was written by Catullus from Verona or Sirmio to Mallius at Baiae, or some place other than Rome, seems patent to us, while 41-160 give no evidence of where they were written, though they seem to have been composed at a sufficiently later period for his grief for his brother to be somewhat assuaged.

Whether the Mallius or Manlius of 1-40 was L. Manlius Torquatus seems to be still *sub iudice*, though Schwabe's arguments in its favor are clever and strong.

Again, it seems impossible that an Allius Mallius or a Mallius Allius should have existed in Rome, though Mr. Ellis teaches us (p. 401) that we should be careful what assertions we make in regard to Roman names.

If we turn to the MSS they do not help us much, their reading is so various, and the corrupt passing of an *n* before *l* into another *l* so very easy. Confining

ourselves to DPGO, in verse 11, we find *manli* DP, *mali* O, *malī* G; in 30, appears *mali* GO; in 41, *quam fallius* GO, *quam salius* P, *quam fallimus* D; in 52, *ali* GP, *alli* O, *aliis* D; in 68, *manlius* DG, *allius marg.* *manlius* O; in 170, *aliis* all MSS. It can be seen from these examples that the external evidence of the MSS does not carry us far towards a solution of the problem.

These are but a few brief points in the argument, but from an entirely dispassionate standpoint, viewing the evidence as a whole, we feel that were we a higher tribunal, instead of a very inferior one, we should be compelled to reverse the decision of the upper court, which we freely grant Mr. Ellis to be.

Mr. Ellis still holds to the opinion expressed in his first edition, that the name of the poet was Quintus and not Gaius; the arguments are so strong for the latter *praenomen* that we do not see how Mr. Ellis can fail to recognize them; to be sure he is supported by such eminent scholars as Lachmann, Mommsen, Haupt, and Scaliger, but of these Lachmann and Mommsen were not acquainted with G and O, and Scaliger had his emendation to support in LXVII 12. Ellis bases his opinion on the authority of the Datanus, Riccardianus, Cujacianus, and the Colbertinus MSS, the first of which he thinks very highly of, though all four are usually considered to be inferior MSS; and on a passage in Pliny's N. H. XXXVII 81, *filius strumae Noni eius quem Catullus poeta in sella curuli uisum indigne tulit*. It is to be observed in regard to the passage from Pliny that the MSS by no means agree, some of them having the words as quoted above, and others placing Q. before the word Catullus, which Mr. Ellis thinks of great importance. He has been at pains to examine, either personally or vicariously, some twenty-one MSS of Pliny, with a result that does not seem to us encouraging to his cause; of these the oldest two (the Bambergensis and the Chifletianus), of the tenth and eleventh centuries respectively, omit the Q. and give *n̄* Catulus; of the later codices, 4 of the thirteenth, 2 of the fourteenth, and 6 of the fifteenth century omit the Q., while only 1 of the twelfth, 2 of the thirteenth, 2 of the fourteenth, and 2 of the fifteenth place the Q. before Catullus. Now it is not at all improbable that in these the Q. crept in from the *quem* which precedes it; or arose from a confusion between the old capital forms of Q and C; or again, of a confusion between the *praenomen* of Quintus Catulus and that of the poet, especially as this actually occurs in the Datanus, which gives the form *Catuli*.

On the other hand, none of the better or the best MSS of Pliny give Quintus, and Jerome especially states in his Chronicle that the poet's name was Gaius, writing it out in full, whilst Apuleius Apolog. 10 writes C. Catullus.

It is noted with pleasure that Ellis has changed the spelling from Virgil to Vergil throughout this edition, in deference, he tells us, "to the arguments of the Roman jurist Castalio, *De Vergili nominis scribendi recta ratione*, Romae 1594.

Prof. Ellis's volume is by no means a reprint of that of 1876. There are comparatively few omissions from his former work, while the pages of the new edition are teeming with rich illustrative passages in both Greek and Latin, which no one but a deeply-read and profound scholar like Mr. Ellis could supply; this is especially the case with the quotations in Greek, from which his wide reading has enabled him to make such valuable selections. Again, in the Latin references he has wisely aimed to quote from "the predecessors or contemporaries, rather than from the followers of Catullus"; not only are these passages more pertinent than many of those in the first edition, but their number is so much increased that they occupy a by no means small proportion of the increase of 116 pages in this over the first edition.

Of the Clarendon Press work, as usual, there is nothing to be said except in commendation.

Amongst all these words of praise it is disagreeable to have to find fault, and grave fault too, with the index, which falls far short of any reasonable standard. It was always a drawback to the first edition that it was not indexed, and we hailed with delight the announcement that this want had been supplied in the present volume, but our disappointment was all the more keen when we found how insufficient it was. It purports to be an "Index of persons and things referred to in the Commentary," and we started to make a list of some of the more notable omissions, taken at random, such as Erycina, Aeneas, Ariadne, Prometheus, Helicon, Pessinus, Cybele, etc., but soon found that this meant the compiling of a new index, in comparison to which the present one would be but a small fraction, and abandoned the attempt.

It is not too often that the world is presented with the exhaustive and learned work of so ripe a scholar as Mr. Ellis, and every student of Catullus owes him a meed of thanks second only in gratitude to that due to the poet himself.

---

WILLIAM H. KLAPP.

The Latin Heptateuch, critically reviewed by JOHN E. B. MAYOR, M.A. Cambridge, University Press, 1889.

This interesting translation of the first seven books of the Old Testament into hexameter verse is, up to the present time, inaccessible in any one work, having undergone a strange history in its fragmentary publication. The first 165 verses of Genesis were published by Wm. Morel in 1560, and have been often reprinted in editions of Tertullian and Cyprian. In 1733 Martène added 1276 verses more from a MS of the ninth century, which completed the book of Genesis with the exception of chapter IX and a part of chapter X. In 1852 Cardinal Pitra published in the *Spicilegium Solesmense* the missing fragment of Genesis, the books of Exodus, Deuteronomy and Joshua, and parts of Leviticus and Numbers. Before his death, which occurred Feb. 9, 1889, he added